DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 150 CG 013 751

AUTHOR Burke, Ronald J.; And Others
TITLE Occupational Locking-In: Some Empirical Findings.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (59th, San Diego, California, April 5-8, 1979); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employee Attitudes; *Job Satisfaction; *Management Development; Morale; *Occupational Mobility; Self Concept; *Stress Variables; Work Attitudes; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

Several factors associated with increasing discontent in middle management ranks have been identified. One of these is known as a boxed-in feeling or locking-in, which refers to the ongoing feeling an individual has when he has almost no opportunity to move from his present job or when the only position for which he is qualified is the job he currently holds. In the work environment individuals locked into their jobs do not appear to be radically different from their less locked-in peers. They share the same work values and express the same degree of identification with their organization, but are less committed to their work and report a poorer utilization of their skills on their jobs. They also experience more stress from the rapid rate of change in their organizations, and have lower feelings of self-worth in relation to their jobs. (Author/PJC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176150

Occupational Locking - In: Some Empirical Findings[1]

Ronald J. Burke, Tamara Weir and Richard E. DuWors, Jr.

York University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Kay (1975) identified several factors associated with increasing discontent in middle management ranks. He described one of these as a boxed-in feeling, which refers to the ongoing feeling an individual has when he has almost no opportunity to move from his present job or when the only position for which he is qualified is the job he currently holds. Quinn (1975) has used the phrase locking-in to refer to the same phenomenon. Quinn distinguished three components of locking-in. The first involves a low probability that an individual could secure another job as good or better than his present one. The second component involves an individual having little opportunity to modify a presently disliked employment situation by securing a change in his job assignments. The third component is represented in a low likelihood that a worker who was dissatisfied with his job could take psychological refuge in the performance of other roles not linked to his job.

There are a number of forces operating in society today which lead one to speculate that occupational locking-in is on the increase. This has not yet been substantiated by direct examination however. But it is apparent that current economic conditions have not been stable, and have been less than congenial

CG013751

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ronald J. Burke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

to the development of new industry and the growth and expansion of old. Unemployment is becoming a more familiar condition in managerial ranks. The large supply of graduates pouring out of schools of management, the widespread discrimination against managerial talent over 40 years of age, the subtle pressures for early retirement of managers who want to keep on working are all facts which contribute to locking people into their existing positions.

Kay (1975) outlined a commonplace chain of events leading to locking-in. He describes a series of steps where a college graduate is (1) hired into an organization because he has particular skills; (2) remains in the same area over a number of years and becomes a functional specialist, and at the same time (3) he is also developing his expertise he is also attaining middle management status, and receiving the appropriate rewards for his service and good performance. However, in time, upward mobility may no longer be possible and yet he may feel the need of a change. At this point he may find that it is very difficult for him to make a lateral shift. First of all he has no experience in any area other than his original skill area, and secondly his salary is too high for the experience level he offers to other areas. He is locked-in.

There are a number of important questions which can be raised regarding the individual who feels locked into his job. First of all what effects does feeling locked-in have on the individual? Secondly, how do individuals who feel locked-in

cope with their situations? Thirdly, how does the being locked-in concept influence the relationship among other individual and organizational level variables?

Kay (1975) discussed some of the coping behaviors middle managers use to deal with work-related concerns such as feeling locked-in. Certain individuals plan a second career and enroll in an educational program for this purpose, others become entrepreneurs, still others search to apply their skills and talents in a completely different environment (business vs. academia vs. government) from the one they are working in. Some individuals find a satisfactory resolution by redirecting their interests and energies to non-work areas of life, and seek fulfilment outside of their jobs. Kay also comments on some maladaptive coping behaviors and outcomes relevant to middle managers. He refers to apathy as one mode of coping, which leads to stagnation, a deterioration of skills and obsolescence, and eventually to candidacy for forced early retirement. As plateaued careers and feeling locked-in often occur in mid-life years, they may exacerbate the normal mid-life crises, to what extent is not yet clear.

Another unknown, is how much work-related factors contribute to such coping behaviors as alcoholism and marriage breakdown.

An empirical study by Quinn (1975) focussed research attention on the locking-in concept as a moderator of the association between job satisfaction and indicators of individual well-being and mental health. Quinn hypothesized that the relationship between job satisfaction and selected mental health

variables would be greater among workers who were locked into their jobs than among those not locked into them. Data from a national probability sample supported this notion for the relationship between job satisfaction and the mental health index and job related tension, but not for the relationship with life satisfaction.

Having demonstrated that locking-in could be a useful research construct, Quinn (1975) went on to identify a number of societal, organizational and personal attributes related to the phenomena. These include measures of labor market conditions (current level of business activity, number of alternative organizations available to the individual); organizational characteristics (growth pattern of the organization, size, preference to promote from within than recruit from outside, organizational attitude towards lateral transfer); demographic variables (having a physical or nervous handicap, age, sex, race, education); properties of the self (self-esteem, perceived saleability, and the individual's belief that he can secure another job).

The present investigation examines the relationship of feeling locked-in to a wide range of characteristics and experiences of job incumbents. Among the variables considered were personality factors, demographic characteristics, work and non-work demands or stressors, areas of work and life satisfaction, and physical health factors. If feeling locked-in does become a more common occurrence of job incumbents it is vital to have

a better understanding of the phenomenon and its implications for individuals and the staffing and managing of organizations.

Method

Respondents

Respondents were 127 senior administrators of correctional institutions within a single Canadian province. They were job incumbents from the three most senior administrative positions: Superintendents, Deputy Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents. Approximately fifty correctional institutions of various types were operated by this government department. The potential number of job incumbents in the above-mentioned positions numbered 150, therefore, almost 85% of the population volunteered to participate in the research.

Procedure

Every job incumbent was invited to participate in an investigation of occupational demands and individual well-being. Participation was voluntary and required spending one day at a university laboratory. The morning session involved a physical health examination; the afternoon session required that respondents complete a series of questionnaires, some standardized, others specifically created for the study.

Measures

Locking-In

This variable was assessed by an eight item scale. Some of the items were: How easy do you think it would be for you to transfer to a comparable position in the fields of Probation/

Parole/Aftercare within the Ministry? How easy would it be for you to upgrade or expand the breadth of your skills so you would be more attractive to other potential employers outside the ministry? How transferable are the skills and knowledge you have picked-up while working in Correctional Institutions of the Ministry? About how easy would it be for you to find a job with another employer with approximately the same income and fringe benefits you now have? How willing would you be to accept a demotion to a lower level job within the Ministry to get out of a job that you didn't like? These items were linked to a five-point Likert scale, e.g. (1) Not easy/willing (transferable)at all, (3) Somewhat easy-willing/transferable and (5) Very easy/willing/transferable. Responses to the eight items were combined into a single score.

Personal and Institutional Characteristics

Certain personal demographic information was collected. This included: age, years of formal schooling, years married, number of children, level of education, and present position. Data on several job and organizational characteristics were also obtained: number of employees supervised, length of time with organization, length of time in present job, number of promotions, and interest in further promotion. Finally, particular characteristics of the organization in which the job incumbent was employed were noted, such as size, number of programs and number of professionals (educators, psychologists) employed. A wide range of responses were evident on all the personal and demographic variables.

Job Satisfaction and Attitudes

Five areas of job satisfaction and job attitudes were examined: work values, occupational self-esteem, job satisfaction, organizational identification and job involvement.

The Survey of Work Values (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting and Smith, 1971) an index constructed to measure several areas of work values relevant to the Protestant Work Ethic was employed. The scale measured six aspects such as Pride in Work, Job Involvement, Attitude towards Earnings and Upward Striving. Fifty-four attitude statements linked to six point Likert scales from Strongly agree to Strongly disagree were presented to respondents.

Occupational self-esteem was measured by a 12 item scale (Caplan, Cobb, French, Harrison and Pinneau, 1975) in which respondents described themselves in their present jobs. Seven point scales were anchored by bi-polar adjectives (e.g., Successful - Not successful, Liked - Disliked, Competent - Not competent, Respected - Not respected). Responses to the 12 items were combined to produce the occupational self-esteem measure.

Five specific areas of job satisfaction were assessed using the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) developed by Smith, Hulin and Kendall (1969). These five areas of job satisfaction were: Work, Pay, Co-workers, Supervision and Promotion.

Global or overall job satisfaction was assessed using six items (Quinn and Shepard, 1974). Examples of these items were: All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it? Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with another employer within the next year? Responses were made on three or four-point Likert scales.

Organizational identification was measured by a series of 12 items used earlier by Hall, Schneider and Nygren (1970). The following items are examples: I would advise a young high school graduate to choose a career with our organization; It makes me very angry when I hear (or read about) someone criticizing our organization; I feel a sense of pride in working for our organization. Respondents indicated the extent to which they agreed with each statement on a seven-point scale anchored by (1) Strongly agree and (7) Strongly disagree.

Job involvement was measured by an eight item scale (Lodahl and Kejner, 1965). The measure included the following items: I don't mind spending half an hour past quitting time if I can finish a task. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job, I live, eat, and breathe my job. And, I am very much involved in my work. Respondents indicated the degree to which they agreed with each statement on a seven point scale anchored by (1) Strongly agree and (7) Strongly disagree.

Occupational Demands

Seventeen different sources of occupational demand were assessed. All but one occupational demand (Concentration) were measured using multi-item measures. Eleven of these demands were

examined in previous work of Caplan, et al., (1975). These were: Concentration; Hours Worked per Week; Job Complexity; Role Ambiguity, Quantitative Overload; Responsibility for People; Under-utilization of Skills, Lack of Influence, Inequity in Pay, Job Future Ambiguity, and Role Conflict. Another was considered in a study by Caplan (1971) - Responsibility for Things. The remaining five occupational demands - Pace of Change; Stress in Communicating; Boundary Spanning Activities; Qualitative Pressures; and Unique Stressors (unique to the corrections milieu) were created specifically for this study. In all cases responses were of Likert scale format, usually on a five-point scale.

Life Demands

Three measures of life demands were included: Life concerns, Number of stressful life events experienced in the preceding year, and Upsettingness of stressful life events experienced in the preceding year.

Life Concerns

This area was assessed with 26 items. Respondents indicated how much time they spent worrying about personal, familiar and societal situations (e.g., Getting along when I'm too old to work; Sickness in my family; Not being able to understand or talk to my children; Feeling that the pace of social and economic change is too rapid). Responses were made on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Never, through (3) Sometimes, to (5) Nearly all the time. A total measure of life concerns was obtained by summing the responses to the twenty-six items.

Stressful Life Events

Respondents were asked to indicate which of a series of events had been encountered during the preceding year. Some of the 54 items were obtained from earlier work by Holmes and Rahe (1967), while others were written specifically for this study guided by comments by Dowhrenwend and Dowhrenwend (1974) that negative events were more predictive of well-being criteria than positive items. On an a priori basis three measures were produced: (1) Number of work-related stressful events (e.g., Failed to get desired promotion, Unwanted changes in responsibilities at work); (2) Number of non-work life stressful events (e.g., Death of a spouse, Driver's license suspended, Took an important exam); and (3) Number of stressful events combining both work and non-work life events.

Upsettingness of Stressful Life Events

When a particular stressful life event had been experienced during the preceding year, respondents were asked to indicate how upsetting that event had been. Responses ranged on a 7 point scale from (1) Not at all upsetting, through (4) Somewhat upsetting, to (7) Very upsetting. A measure of average upsettingness was determined by dividing the total upsettingness value by the number of stressful life events experienced. A mean upsettingness score was computed for each of (1) work events, (2) non-work events, and (3) total work and non-work events.

Impact of Job on Personal and Family Life

Respondents indicated the degree to which their present jobs affected their personal, home and family lives. A fifty item measure was created to examine ten areas of personal and home life on which work might impact. These were: Requirements to relocate, Relationship with wife, Relationship with children, Respondent's physical and mental state after work, Social life, Household and family management, Week-end and vacation time, Leisure and self-development activities, Concerns for physical health and safety, and Requirements for exemplary behavior. The measure included the following items: Because of my job I don't have much energy left for anything outside of work; My job makes it difficult for me to participate as much as I want in bringing up my children; I am sometimes angry and irritable at home because of things that happen at work; and For the sake of my job I've had to move away from my friends and/or relatives who are important to me. Respondents indicated their agreement with each of these statements on a five point scale ranging from (1) Strongly agree, through (3) Neither agree nor disagree, to (5) Strongly disagree. Responses to the 50 items were combined into a composite measure.

Marital Satisfaction

Satisfaction with marriage and satisfaction with one's experience with parenting were both examined. To assess marital satisfaction a scale developed by Orden and Bradburn (1969) was used. Respondents indicated from a list of eight positive

marital experiences (e.g., Had a good laugh together or shared a joke, Been affectionate toward each other, Entertained friends in our home) which ones they and their wives had shared together in the past few weeks. Then, respondents indicated from a list of nine negative marital experiences (e.g., Not showing love, Irritating personal habits, Being tired, Being away from home) which ones had caused differences of opinions or were problems in their marriages during the past few weeks. A marital satisfaction score was obtained by subtracting the number of negative marital behaviors from the number of positive marital behaviors.

The two global items measuring marital satisfaction were: Taking all things together, would you say your marriage is very happy (1), pretty happy (3), or not too happy (5); and During the past few weeks have you every felt that you were not the kind of husband you would like to be? These were combined into a single measure.

Finally, two items were included to assess respondent satisfaction with their role as parents. These were: Taking all things together, how would you describe your recent experiences as a parent -- would you say that they have been completely satisfying (1); pretty satisfying (3), or not especially satisfying (5); and (2) During the past few weeks have you every felt that you were not the kind of father you would like to be? These were combined into a single measure.

Social Support

Five measures of social support and a measure of the preference for keeping problems to one's self were employed. Social support from friends and neighbors, co-workers and spouse was assessed separately by a series of thirteen questions. Examples of the items were as follows: I talk about my work concerns and difficulties with my co-workers; My Friends and neighbors go out of their way to be helpful when my work gets me down; I feel my wife can understand how I think and feel about situations at work. Tangible assistance from others in the form of money or help with household tasks was assessed with two items. General and global feelings of being connected to others in a relationship of mutual assistance and obligation was measured by two items. In total there were 51 items, all tied to a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) Very true of me to (5) Not at all true.

Life Satisfaction

Life satisfaction was measured using a ten-item scale assessing specific aspects of respondent's present life, two global items. They first asked respondents to describe their lives on 10 seven-point scales anchored by bi-polar adjectives (e.g., Boring - Interesting; Tied down - Free; Full - empty). Responses to the 10 items were combined into a single measure.

The global assessments of life satisfaction were: Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days? (5) Very happy, (3) Pretty happy, and (1) Not too happy; In

general how satisfying do you find the way you're spending your life these days? (5) Completely satisfying; (3) Pretty satisfying; and (1) Not very satisfying. Responses to these two items were then combined into a single measure.

Negative Affective States

This area was examined using a 90 item developed by Cobb, Brooks, Kasl and Conhelly (1966); assessing 19 affective states. Respondents indicated how true each of the ninety statements were of their feelings today (e.g., I feel as though nothing I do is any good, I lose my temper easily, I feel lonesome, I often feel a little irritated or annoyed about things). Five alternatives were present ranging from (1) Very true, through (3) Neither true nor untrue, to (5) Very untrue.

Factor analysis of the 19 affective states using the principle components varimax rotation method yielded five interpretable factors accounting for 66% of the variance. These factors, and the number of affective categories loading on each were: Depression and Worthlessness, 5 affect categories; Aggression, 2 affect categories; Suspicion, 3 affect categories; Anxiety and Tension, 5 affect categories; Guilt and Isolation, 3 affect categories. Thirteen of the nineteen feeling states were positively and significantly affective states was obtained by summing responses to those thirteen.

Psychosomatic Symptoms

Psychosomatic symptoms were assessed using a nineteen item scale developed and employed by Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960).

Respondents indicated the frequency of certain events or conditions in the past year. Examples of the items included: Cramps in my legs, Headaches, Tightness or heaviness in my chest, and Having trouble getting to sleep. Items were linked to a 4-point scale: (1) Often, (2) Sometimes, (3) Rarely, and (4) Never. Responses to these 19 items were combined into a single measure.

Life Style and Health Behaviors

Several aspects of life style and health habits were examined with eleven items : (1) Do you smoke? I smoke, I used to smoke but have stopped, I have never smoked as a habit. (2) If you smoke, how many cigarettes do you smoke per day on the average? (3) How many cups of coffee do you drink per day? (4) How often do you usually have a drink of liquor, beer or wine? (5) Think of all the times you have had liquor, beer or wine recently. When you drink, how often do you have as many as five or six drinks? (6) Three or four drinks? (7) One or two drinks? (8) When was the last time you made use of your own private doctor or medical services or clinic away from your work place other than for a routine physical exam? (9) How many days have you missed from work during the past year because of illness? (10) Are you currently taking any medication for an illness or physical condition? (11) A measure of exercise habits were developed by combining three items dealing with the number of stairs climbed daily, amount of walking done daily, and amount of regular exercise undertaken.

Physicial Health (Physician Diagnoses)

Each respondent was given a complete physical health examination by a physician. The physician then indicated on a checklist whether respondents currently had certain symptoms, illnesses or disease conditions or had had them in the past. Twenty-six categories were listed (e.g., Hypertension, Heart failure, Asthma, Peptic ulcer, Migraine headaches, Muscle tension, Arthritis). The diagnoses of the physician were dichotomous (Yes/No).

Physical Health (Physiological Parameters)

A number of physiological variables were assessed for each respondent by the physiologist attached to the research team. These were: Body weight, Pounds overweight, Systolic blood pressure, Diastolic blood pressure, Forced vital capacity, Forced expiratory volume, Maximum oxygen consumption, Resting ECG, Exercise ECG, Blood sugar, Blood urea nitrogen, Serum uric acid, Cholesterol, Triglycerides, Cortisol and Thyroxine. These parameters were selected because they were indicators of health and fitness or have been implicated in stress research.

Personality Variables

Type A Behavior This was assessed using a 44 item scale developed by Sales (1969) and refined by Caplan (1971). Nine dimensions of Type A behavior were examined: Involved striving, Persistence, Competitive orientation, Range of activities, Positive attitude toward pressure, Environmental overburdening, Sense of time urgency, Leadership, and History of past achievements. Respondents indicated how true each of

the 44 statements were of them (e.g., I enjoy working against deadlines; I guess there are people who can be nonchalant about their work, but I'm not one of them; I've often been asked to be an officer of some group or groups). Response alternatives were seven in number ranging from (1) Very true of me, through (4) Neither very true of me nor very untrue of me, to (7) Not at all true of me. Responses to all forty-four items were combined to produce the Type A behavior measure.

Need for Social Approval The Crowne-Marlowe Need for Social Approval scale (Crowne & Marlowe 1964) was included in this study. A factor analytic study by Lillibridge (1970) found two factors in the measure: (1) Deny Bad Self, which refers to the tendency to deny that one can be bad to others. An item example is "I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way." (2) Overconformity to Norms, which measures the extent individuals claim they always do good to others. An item example is "I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble". Respondents were asked to check True or False for each item.

Flexibility - Rigidity Another personality measure included in this study was the Flexibility - Rigidity scale from the California Personality Inventory (Gough, 1957). This scale measures the degree to which an individual can tolerate uncertainty. Statements such as "I often wish people would be more definite about things" and "For most questions, there is just one right answer, once a person is able to get all the facts" comprise the scale. Respondents check an item of a 4 item Likert scale ranging from Very true to Not true at all.

I-E Locus of Control Rotter's (1966) Internal-External scale was also included. This scale measures the degree to which individuals believe in their personal efficacy in directing the course of their lives or the degree to which they feel the course of their lives are subject to external influences or chance events. The scale is made up of paired statements such as the following: 1. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen. 2. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action. Respondents were asked to select the one statement in each pair they believed to be true of them.

The 16 Personality Factor Scale A final measure, the 16 Personality Factor scale developed by Cattell, Herbert and Tatsuoka (1975) was included. The 16PF is a multi-dimensional scale measuring 16 primary personality factors plus four second-order personality factors derived from the forms. Form C of the 16PF with 105 items was used. Three possible answers accompany each item and respondents were asked to check one reflecting their own views.

Results

Locking-In

How "locked-in" was the sample of 127 senior correctional administrators? On the five point scale of locking in, the total sample averaged 2.6.

Thus, in general terms, the sample was slightly locked-in or more locked-in than not locked-in. When the full scale was considered (theoretical range 8 to 40) the mean fell at 21.0, with actual scores ranging from 8 (Highly locked-in) to 36.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 1 presents the correlations between locking-in measure and various demographic characteristics. Statistically significant relationships were present on seven of the 12 variables. Thus, individuals reporting greater feelings of locking-in: (1) were older, (2) had less formal schooling, (3) had more children, (4) had a lower level of education, (5) had been with the organization a longer period of time, (6) had made fewer geographic moves with the organization, and (7) were less interested in further promotions. Locking-in was not correlated to number of dependents, gross income, number of employees supervised, length of time in present job, or number of previous promotions within the organization.

Enter Table 1 About Here

Occupational and Life Demands

Table 2 (top half) presents the correlations between the locking-in measure and 17 sources of job demand. Four statistically significant relationships were evident. Thus, individuals reporting greater locking-in worked fewer hours per week ($r = .18$, $p < .05$), reported greater under-utilization of their skills, ($r = .25$, $p < .01$) less stress in communicating to others ($r = .23$, $p < .01$) and greater stress from the pace of change in their organizations ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$).

Enter Table 2 About Here

Table 2 (bottom half) shows the correlations between the measure of locking-in and (1) amount of life worries and concerns reported by the job incumbents, and (2) number and upsettingness of stressful life events experienced by the job incumbent in work and non-work settings. Individuals reporting greater locking-in reported fewer stressful life events at work ($r = .28$, $p < .001$).

Occupational Satisfactions and Attitudes

Table 3 shows the correlations between the measure of locking-in and various job-related satisfactions and attitudes. Thus job incumbents who saw themselves as more locked-in reported less occupational self-esteem ($r = .27$, $p < .01$). The degree of locking-in was independent of the global measure of job satisfaction and all five of JDI scales.

Enter Table 3 About Here

The measure of locking-in was also not related to any of the six work values assessed by the Survey of Work Values, the degree of organizational identification, or the amount of job involvement.

Impact of Job on Personal and Family Life

The measures of locking-in was not related to the degree respondents' saw their job duties having a negative impact on personal, home and family life (Table 4).

Enter Table 4 About Here

Marital and Parental Satisfaction

The middle third of Table 4 presents the correlations involving the various aspects of marital and parental satisfaction and locking-in. Individuals who reported greater feelings of locking-in also reported less overall marital satisfaction ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$).

Life Satisfaction

The bottom line in Table 4 presents the correlation between the measure of locking-in and the measure of life satisfaction. Administrators describing themselves as more locked-in also were less satisfied with their lives ($r = .18$, $p < .05$).

Social Participation

Table 5 (top half) shows the correlations between the locking-in measure and six aspects of social participation. There was a consistent trend in four of the six relationships. Thus job incumbents reporting greater locking-in visited friends with their spouses less frequently ($r = -.17$, $p < .05$), went out with "the boys" less frequently ($r = -.15$ p .10), had fewer good friends ($r = -.14$, $p < .10$), and spent fewer hours per week participating in community and professional groups ($r = .14$, $p < .10$).

Enter Table 5 About Here

Quality of Supportive Social Relationships

The bottom half of Table 5 shows the correlations between the measure of locking-in and aspects of the supportive social relations enjoyed by the job incumbents. Job incumbents who

reported greater locking-in enjoyed less social support from their co-workers ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$), less social support from their spouses ($r = -.21$, $p < .105$). They also tended to have fewer friends to rely on for concrete help ($r = -.14$, $p < .10$) and a greater preference for keeping their problems to themsevles ($r = -.15$, $p < .10$).

Negative Feeling States

The measure of locking-in was not related to any of the five feeling state factors, or to the total score.

Psychosomatic Symptoms

The measure of locking-in was not related to total psychosomatic symptona score.

Life Style and Health Behaviors

Only one of the 11 life style and health behavior items was significantly correlated with degree of locking-in: administrators reporting greater locking-in also drank alcoholic beverages more frequently ($r = -.19$, $p < .05$).

Physical Health (Phsician Determined)

Only one of the twenty-six health areas examined (arteriosclerosis) was significantly related to the locking-in measure: job incumbents who were more locked-in were also more likely to show signs of arteriosclerosis.

Physical Health (Physiological and Biochemical Indicators)

Only four of the 16 correlations between locking-in and physiological and biochemical stress indicators reached statistical significance. Thus individuals reporting greater locking-in also had a lower fat percent ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), lower blood urea nitrogen ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), and greater thyroxine levels ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$).

Personality Factors

Table 6 presents the correlations between the locking-in measure and four areas of personality: Type A, Flexibility-Rigidity, Locus of Control, and Social Desirability. First, the locking-in measure was significantly related to four of the nine sub-scales of the Type A measure (but not the total score). Thus individuals who were more locked-in also reported a lower competitive orientation ($r = -.17$, $p < .05$), a less positive attitude towards pressure ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$), fewer past achievements in their track record ($r = -.16$, $p < .05$), and were less likely to undertake a wide range of activities simultaneously ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$).

Enter Table 6 About Here

The locking-in measure was not related to the measure of Flexibility-Rigidity. However, the locking-in measure was significantly related to one factor (Control Ideology - a general belief that individuals control their own fate) on Rotter's IE Locus of Control scale, and to the total score. Individuals reporting greater locking-in believed that their future was more likely to be controlled by chance events and the control of others than by their own mastery.

Finally, there was no significant relationship between the locking-in measure and respondents' tendency to describe themselves in socially-desirable ways.

Table 7 presents the correlations between the locking-in measure and the 16 primary and 4 second-order factors on the Cattell 16PF measure. Several significant relationships were present: 11 of the 16 first order factors, all 4 second order factors. Job incumbents reporting greater locking in were more likely to have high scores on G, L, N, Q2, Q4 and second-order factor QII, and low scores on B, C, E, F, M and Q, and second-order factors QI, QIII, and QIV.

Enter Table 7 About Here

Discussion

In the work environment individuals locked into their jobs did not appear to be radically different from their less locked-in peers. They shared the same work values and expressed the same degree of identification with their organization and involvement in their work. The few existing differences centered on particular aspects of job performance and occupational demands. Thus, more locked-in individuals committed fewer hours to their work and reported a poorer utilization of their skills on their jobs. They also experienced more stress from the rate at which things changed in their organizations but on the other had they had found communication with their superiors, subordinates, or public less of a problem to them. Whether this latter finding occurred because they did not communicate as much or because they were more secure with the processes involved was not clear although other findings suggested that the former was more likely. Individuals

who were more locked-in had lower feelings of self-worth in relation to their jobs, had less interest in promotion but generally seemed as fully satisfied with their jobs as the less locked-in administrators.

Piecing together these findings administrators who were more locked-in suggested a picture of individuals in a comfortable but plateaued career perhaps with an impending sense of obsolescence. This was supported by demographic characteristics showing that they were also older, had less formal education, and had been in their present organizations and present job a longer period of time.

Moving beyond the organizational environment and considering aspects of their non-work lives and experiences, individuals who are locked-in did not perceive their work as impinging any differently on their home and family lives. However, they reported being generally less satisfied with their marriages. They also were less involved in relating to people whether it be merely in terms of friendships and community participation, or in terms of a more intimate and supportive social network. Overall, they also expressed less satisfaction with their lives.

Whatever the negative aspects of their lives there were no indications that they were seriously or adversely affecting their psychological or physical health. Although more locked-in individuals drank alcoholic beverages more frequently, they showed no signs of ill health on either the affective, psychosomatic or physical health indices. In summary, then, feeling locked-in seemed to create only modest difficulties for the individuals studied here, being related to a cluster

of variables encompassing a somewhat less-satisfying quality of life.

The findings did provide a more complete personality and graphic profile of the locked-in individual. On the personality dimension, individuals reporting greater feelings of locking-in were generally less competitive and achievement oriented (Type A), more willing to leave their future to factors beyond their control, more emotional, submissive, introverted, subdued, conservative, with greater tension and anxiety, less intelligent and more feeling oriented. Running through these qualities is a lack of interpersonal skill, greater anxiety and emotionalism. Thus these individuals may have become locked-in because of emotional insecurity and behavioral passivity. Longitudinal research is required to examine the predictive validity of these observations.

We expected that locking-in would be associated with poorer psychological and physical well-being. Support of these expectations was weak considering the number of variables examined. Possible explanations might be in the measure of locking-in that was developed (incomplete, not subtle enough), or in the nature of the sample employed (a single organization, and a fairly homogeneous group of occupations), or in the fact that the sample was not locked-in in a way which seriously affects their major life activities and experiences. In fact many of the administrators of the correctional institutions had achieved more with their employing organization than they could have aspired to elsewhere.

We believe that increasing number of administrators will experience locking-in in the next two decades. First, the economy is no longer expanding rapidly. Second, more women, and both male and female MBA graduates are now competing for administrative jobs.

Third, more older workers are staying on their jobs with relaxation of mandatory retirement laws. Fourth, organizations are growing as much through mergers and acquisitions as through expansion. Thus, devoting research attention to the phenomenon appears to be warranted. In addition, the findings indivated that individuals feeling locked-in experienced mild distress (low occupational self-esteem, less life satisfaction) which in itself would require understanding and addressing.

This leads logically to several areas of potential application: programs such as life and career planning and development, individual counselling, second careers, (at the individual level) and job rotation (at the organizational level), redefinition of the concept of career success, and devotion of attention to maintaining job motivation under circumstances of little upward mobility.

All of our information came from the perspective of the job incumbent. A fuller sense of the consequences of locking-in requires the perspective of the employing organization as far as the individual's performance and productivity are concerned, and the perspective of the spouse and family on the problems involved in living with someone who is feeling locked-in. Individuals that are locked-in may ultimately translate these feelings into lower productivity and represent a poor model for junior administrators. Both of these outcomes would detract from organizational effectiveness.

Footnotes

1 This research was supported in part by grants from the Donner Foundation and Federal Health and Welfare. We would like to acknowledge the co-operation of the organization and the men and women who volunteered and made the study possible. Leona Burns provided assistance in the preparation of the manuscript.

References

Bradburn, N. The Structure of Psychological Well-Being. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Caplan, R. D. Organizational Stress and Individual Strain: A Social Psychological Study. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 72-14, 822.

Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Harrison, R. V. & Pinneau, Jr., S. R. Job Demands and Worker Health. NIOSH Research Report, 1975.

Cattell, R. B., Herbert, W. E., & Tatsuoka, M. M. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Urbaba, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1974.

Cobb, S., Brooks, G. W., Kasl, S.V., & Connelly, W. E. The health of people changing jobs: A description of a longitudinal study. American Journal of Public Health, 1966, 59, 1476-1481.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe,D. The Approval Motive: Studies in Evaluative Independence. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

Dowhrenwend, B. S. & Dowhrenwend, B. P. Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects. New York: John Wiley, 1974.

Gough, H. G. California Personality Inventory Manual. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J. & Feld, S. Americans' View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Hall, D. T., Schneider, B. & Nygren, H. T. Personal factors in organizational identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1970, 15, 176-190.

Holmes, T. H. & Rahe, R.H. The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1967, 11, 213-218.

Kay, E. Middle management. In O'Toole, J. Work and the Quality of Life. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1974.

Lillibridge, J. R. Suggested personality indices based on factor analysis of personality scale items. Ecology of Employment Termination Project Analysis Memo # 8. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1970.

Lodahl, T. M. & Kejner, M. The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1965, 49, 24-33.

Orden, S. R. & Bradburn, W. M. Dimensions of marriage happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1968, 73, 715-731.

Quinn, R. P. and Shepard, L. J. The 1972-1973 Quality of Employment Survey. Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: 1974.

Quinn, R. P. Locking-in as a moderator of the relationship between job satisfaction and Mental Health. Unpublished Manuscript. Survey Research Centre, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: 1975.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs. 1966, 80, 1-28.

Sales, S. M. Differences among individuals in effective, behavioural, biochemical and psychological responses to variations in work load. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-18098.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, P. & Hulin, M. The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes, Chicago, Ill.

Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P. & Smith, P. C. Development of the Survey of Work Values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1971, 55, 331-338.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics	Locking-in
Age	-.36*
Formal Schooling	.37*
Number of Persons Supported	.06
Gross Income	.13
Number of Children	-.18***
Level of Education	.28*
Number of Employees Supervised	-.04
Length of Time with Organization	-.33*
Length of Time in Present Job	-.11
Number of Geographic Moves with Organization	.18***
Number of Promotions within the Organization	-.10
Interest in Further Promotion	-.30*

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 2

Occupational Demands	Locking-in
Concentration	.08
Hours Worked per Week	.18***
Job Complexity	.06
Role Ambiguity	.09
Quantitative Overload	.02
Responsibility for Things	.08
Rate of Change	-.18***
Responsibility for People	.05
Under-utilization of skills	.25**
Lack of Influence	.11
Stress in Communicating	.23**
Inequity in Pay	-.04
Job Future Ambiguity	-.04
Boundary Spanning Activities	.05
Role Conflict	-.07
Quality Pressures	.12
Unique Stressors	.01
Life Demands	
Life Concerns	-.10
Number of Stressful Life Events	
Work	.28*
Non-Work	-.06
Total	.11
Upsettingness of Stressful Life Events	
Work	.06
Non-Work	-.05
Total	-.10

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 3

Occupational Satisfactions and Attitudes	Locking-In
Occupational Self-Esteem	.27**
Job Satisfaction	
Global Job Satisfaction	-.00
JDI Satisfaction with Promotion	.07
JDI Satisfation with Work	.04
JDI Satisfaction with Pay	.14
JDI Satisfaction with Supervisor	.12
JDI Satisfaction with Co-Workers	.11
Survey of Work Values	
Social Status	-.07
Activity Preference	-.06
Job Involvement	-.02
Upward Striving	-.01
Attitudes Towards Earnings	-.03
Pride in Work	.03
Organizational Identification	-.05
Job Involvement	.14

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 4

	Locking-In
Impact on Personal and Home Life	-.05
Marital Satisfaction	
Positive Marital Behaviors	.15
Negative Marital Behaviors	.02
Orden-Bradburn Positive - Negative Marital Behaviors	.06
Global Marital Satisfaction	-.30*
Global Parental Satisfaction	.09
Life Satisfaction	.18***

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 5

Social Participation	Locking-In
Frequency visiting friends	-.17***
Frequency "out with the boys"	-.15
Number of good friends	-.14
Number of community organizations belonged to	.10
Hours per week spent in community organizations	.14
Officer in community organizations	-.10
Quality and Quantity of Social Support	
Social Support from Co-workers	-.20***
Social Support from Spouse	-.21***
Social Support from Friends and Neighbours	-.09
Concrete Help and Assistance	-.14
Prefer to Keep Problems to Self	-.15
General Social Support	-.08

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 6

Personality Factors	Locking-In
Type A	
Involved Striving	.02
Persistence	.07
Competitive Orientation	-.17***
Range of Activities	-.18***
Positive Attitude Toward Pressure	-.20***
Environmental Overburdening	.05
Sense of Time Urgency	-.03
Leadership	-.12
History of Past Achievement	-.16***
Total Type A Score (44 items)	-.12
California Psychological Inventory	
Flexibility - Rigidity	.12
Rotter Locus of Control	
Personal Control	-.02
Control Ideology	-.24**
Locus of Control	-.19**
Crowne-Marlow Social Desirability	
Deny Bad Self	.14
Assert Good Self	-.04
Social Desirability	.06

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

Table 7

16 Personality Factor		Locking-In
Factor A	Critical/Good Natured	.02
Factor B	Low Intelligence/High Intelligence	.17***
Factor C	Emotional Instability/Maturity	.24**
Factor E	Submissive/Dominant	.22**
Factor F	Silent/Talkative	.26**
Factor G	Quitting/Perservering	-.15***
Factor H	Shy-Adventurous	.14
Factor I	Though Minded/Tenderminded	.04
Factor L	Trusting/Suspecting	-.20**
Factor M	Conventional/Unconventional	.27**
Factor N	Naive/Shrewd	-.15***
Factor O	Self Confident/Worrying	-.07
Factor Q1	Conservative/Radical	.28*
Factor Q2	Group Dependent/Self Reliant	-.28*
Factor Q3	Uncontrolled/Controlled	-.02
Factor Q4	Relaxed/Tense	-.16***
Factor QI	Intraversion/Extraversion	.32*
Factor QII	Adjustment/Anxiety	-.21*
Factor QIII	Feeling/Thinking	.21*
Factor QIV	Subdued/Independence	.33*

* Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .001 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .01 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

*** Correlation is significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence, two-tailed test.

NOTE: A positive correlation indicates individuals reporting more locking-in also displayed more of the characteristics on the left; a negative correlation indicates individuals reporting more locking-in also displayed more of the characteristics on the right.